

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough examination of this application. The Office Action, however, tentatively rejected all pending claims 1-7 and 17-18. Applicant has amended claim 1 to incorporate the subject matter of claim 2 (and has correspondingly canceled claim 2). Claims 3 and 4 are amended to change their dependency from claim 2 to claim 1. For at least the following reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

Regarding claim 1 (formerly claim 2), the Office Action rejected this claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over U.S. published application 2002/0113924 to Saito. Applicant disagrees with this application of Saito. The direct backlight module of claim 1 defines "at least one transparent support disposed in the chamber to support the diffuser and the reflecting plate, wherein the at least one transparent support includes a retaining portion and a supporting plate connected to the retaining portion and disposed between the diffuser and the reflecting plate." (*Emphasis added.*)

In Saito, the HLD (retaining portion) extends upward to abut the TPS (transparent support) as shown in Fig. 6, and the HLD and the FLM-D (supporting plate) are separated elements. In the claimed inventive embodiment, however, the retaining portion extends downward from the supporting plate to abut the reflecting plate. That is, in the claimed embodiment of claim 1, calls for a supporting portion *connected to* the retaining portion and disposed between the diffuser and the reflecting plate. In Saito, the corresponding elements are separated (as shown in FIG. 6). Accordingly, the embodiment of claim 1 and Saito have different structures. In the structure of Saito, the reflecting plate REF must have holes for the HLD passing through, and in such a structure, considerable steps must be provided for assembly. In the application, because the

retaining portion extends from the supporting plate, when the supporting plate is mounted, the retaining portion is positioned and capable of functioning. No holes are needed on the reflecting plate. The application has less assembly steps which save time and cost. The application has superior effect over Saito in assembly and cost.

It should be appreciated that not all of these distinguishing characteristics are embodied in claim 1, as they need not be. Instead, claim 1 recites a structure that patently defines over the structure of Saito. For at least this reason, the rejection under 35 USC 103 should be withdrawn.

For at least the same reasons, the rejections of dependent claims 3 to 7 and 17 and 18 should be withdrawn as well.

No fee is believed to be due in connection with this Amendment and Response to Restriction Requirement. If, however, any fee is believed to be due, you are hereby authorized to charge any such fee to deposit account No. 20-0778.

Respectfully submitted,

By:


Daniel R. McClure, Reg. No. 38,962

Thomas, Kayden, Horstemeyer & Risley, LLP
100 Galleria Pkwy, NW
Suite 1750
Atlanta, GA 30339
770-933-9500